



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,746	11/21/2003	Andreas Kemmler	6631P008	1795
7590	02/11/2005			
Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP Suite 510 60 S. Market Street San Jose, CA 95113			EXAMINER HWANG, JOON H	
			ART UNIT 2162	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/718,746

Applicant(s)

KEMMLER, ANDREAS

Examiner

Joon H. Hwang

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The claims 1-20 are pending.

Priority

2. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Germany on 10/15/2003. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the 103 48 665.8 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1, 3, 7, 10, 11, 13, 17, and 20 are objected to because of the following informalities:

“the data object” in line 6 of claim 1 should be “a data object”.

“the form” in line 7 of claim 1 should be “a form”.

“the record object data” in lines 2-3 of claim 3 should be “a record object data”.

“the form” in line 2 of claim 7 should be “a form”.

“the registration time...the identifier...the initiating user” in lines 2-3 of claim 10 should be “a registration time...an identifier...an initiating user”.

“the data object” in line 6 of claim 11 should be “a data object”.

“the form” in line 7 of claim 11 should be “a form”.

“the record object data” in line 2 of claim 13 should be “a record object data”.

“the form” in line 2 of claim 17 should be “a form”.

“the registration time...the identifier...the initiating user” in lines 2-3 of claim 20 should be “a registration time...an identifier...an initiating user”.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1, 2, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim as follows:

Claim 1 recites the limitation “the information” in line 14, and it is unclear whether it is the information about the data object or the information about the registration.

Claim 2 recites the limitation “the same interface” in line 2, and it is unclear which interface the limitation is referring.

Claim 11 recites the limitation “the information” in line 14, it is unclear whether it is the information about the data object or the information about the registration.

Claim 12 recites the limitation “the same interface” in line 2, and it is unclear which interface the limitation is referring.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-3, 6, 8-13, 16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ching et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,407,761) in view of Brodsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,895,472).

With respect to claim 1, Ching discloses an application layer (item 206 in fig. 2) in which, independently of one another, applications for registering data objects of various data object types into a database associated with a respective application can be executed (i.e., applications register objects in the Business Object Repository/Database, lines 54-57 in col. 3, lines 10-21 in col. 4, and lines 43-48 in col. 5); the respective addressed application in the application layer, in response to a registration operation, producing information about the data object which is to be registered (lines 43-48 in col. 5). Ching discloses a record layer which is encapsulated with respect to the application layer and in which a number of record writers (i.e., BAPI interface) each having a dynamic interface is implemented (fig. 5, fig. 6, and line 66 in col. 4 thru line 29 in col. 5). Ching discloses a hierarchy (table) in which a data object type has a respective associated record writer; the record writer associated by means of the table being designed to access the reference and hence the information via the interface (fig. 8, lines 40-51 in col. 4, and lines 21-29 in col. 6). Ching discloses a

record registrar (i.e., Business Object Repository/Database) for permanently storing record object data, transferred by a record writer and comprising information about the data object which is to be registered (lines 30-48 in col. 5 and lines 1-29 in col. 6).

Ching does not explicitly disclose information about the registration. However, Brodsky discloses creating a log for data manipulations (i.e., registering an object) in an object-oriented system (lines 20-31 in col. 2 and lines 30-34 in col. 8) in order to capture changes in the object-oriented system concerning information about the registration in the form of a reference of prescribed structure. Therefore, based on Ching in view of Brodsky, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the log of Brodsky to the system of Ching in order to capture changes in the object-oriented database.

With respect to claim 2, Ching teaches the record writers (BAPI interfaces) have the same interface (lines 52-65 in col. 4 and fig. 6).

With respect to claim 3, Ching discloses the record registrar (Business Object Repository/Database) is designed to produce and store a change record comprising at least some of the record object data (lines 31-48 in col. 5 and fig. 11).

With respect to claim 6, Ching discloses a management module (database management system 208 in fig. 2) in the application layer for creating, changing, or erasing a table entry (lines 10-21 in col. 4). The limitations of claim 6 are rejected in the analysis of claim 1 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 8, Ching discloses various record writers derived from a stand record writer for a standard data object type which inherit at least one of the standard records writer's methods and/or its interface (lines 52-65 in col. 4).

With respect to claim 9, Ching discloses the record writers can be created or changed during operation of the database system (line 66 in col. 4 thru line 13 in col. 5).

With respect to claim 10, Brodsky further discloses the information comprises the data object before registration, the data after registration, the registration time and the identifier of the initiating user or process (lines 20-31 in col. 2 and lines 30-34 in col. 8). Therefore, the limitations of claim 10 are rejected in the analysis of claim 1 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

Claims 11-13, 16, and 18-20 are essentially the same as claims 1-3, 6, and 8-10 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a method rather than a system and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

9. Claims 4-5 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ching et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,407,761) in view of Brodsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,895,472), and further in view of Gerard et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,230,311).

With respect to claim 4, Ching and Brodsky disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed above except customizing the table. However, Gerard discloses customizing table upstream of the table (the method table), in which customizing table it is possible to activate writing for various data object types (abstract, lines 14-33 in col. 6, and lines 9-41 in col. 12) in order to selectively allow writing operations for various

Art Unit: 2162

data object types. Therefore, based on Ching in view of Brodsky, and further in view of Gerard, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize customizing the table of Gerard to the system of Ching in order to selectively perform writing operations for various data object types.

With respect to claim 5, Gerard further discloses customizing table contains differentiation parameters (abstract, lines 14-33 in col. 6, and lines 9-41 in col. 12). Therefore, the limitations of claim 5 are rejected in the analysis of claim 4 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claims 14-15 are rejected in the analysis of claims 4-5 above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

10. Claims 7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ching et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,407,761) in view of Brodsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,895,472), and further in view of Soderstrom et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,741,982).

With respect to claim 7, Ching and Brodsky disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed above. Ching further discloses a SAP system (lines 52-65 in col. 4). Ching and Brodsky do not explicitly disclose a record writer implemented in the form of an ABAP class with methods and an interface. However, Soderstrom teaches ABAP can be used to create functions for an application in a SAP system (lines 26-57 in col. 2). Therefore, based on Ching in view of Brodsky, and further in view of Soderstrom, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

Art Unit: 2162

was made to utilize the ABAP of Soderstrom to the system of Ching for another way of creating a function in the SAP system.

The limitations of claim 17 are rejected in the analysis of claim 7 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joon H. Hwang whose telephone number is 571-272-4036. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00(M~F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOHN E BREENE can be reached on 571-272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Joon Hwang
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100


JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

2/4/05